

Appln No. 10/617,884
Amdt date September 24, 2007
Reply to Office action of March 23, 2007

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings includes changes to FIGs. 1 - 6. These sheets, which include FIGs. 1 -6, replace the original sheets including FIGs. 1 - 6.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets
 Annotated Sheets Showing Changes

Appln No. 10/617,884
Amdt date September 24, 2007
Reply to Office action of March 23, 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed March 23, 2007, claims 1-84 were pending. The Office Action issued a restriction requirement, requiring election of either claims 1-48 or claims 49-84. The Office Action objected to the drawings as not having descriptive text labels. The Office Action further objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The Office Action objected to claims 21 and 45 for informalities. The Office Action objected to multiple claims as containing the phrase "adapted to". The Office Action objected to the specification for a lack of conformance to 37 SFR 1.77(b), which provides guidelines for the arrangement of the specification. The Office Action rejected claims 7-10 and 31-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The Office Action rejected claims 3-6 and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 14, 16-19, 25, 26, 35, 38, and 40-43 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,822,300 to Johnson et al. ("Johnson"). The Office Action rejected claims 20-23 and 44-47 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,570,848 to Loughran et al. ("Loughran").

The Office Action also objected to claims 13, 15, 24, 37, 39 and 48 as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but indicated they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant's have now substantially included the text of claim 15 in claim 1, rewritten claims 15 and 24 in independent form, substantially included the text of claim 39 in claim 25, rewritten claims 37 and 48 in independent form, and cancelled claims 3-10, 15, 27-34, 39, and 49-84.

In more detail, claims 1-84 were pending. Claims 3-10, 15, 27-34, 39, and 49-84 are cancelled. Claims 1-2, 11-14, 16-26, 35-38 and 40-48 are now pending. Claims 1, 2, 11-14, 16, 17, 19-21, 23-25, 37, 45 and 48 are amended.

Regarding the restriction requirement, The Office Action states:

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

Appln No. 10/617,884
Amdt date September 24, 2007
Reply to Office action of March 23, 2007

I. Claims 1-48, drawn to a means and method for switching data, classified in class 370, subclass 236.

II. Claims 49-84, drawn to an interface comprising a means for serializing parallel data, classified in class 370, subclass 366." (Office Action, page 2).

Applicants hereby confirm the election of claims 1-48, Group I without traverse. Claims 49-84, Group II, are cancelled without prejudice.

The Office Action objected to the drawings as not having descriptive text labels. The drawings have been amended to include more descriptive text labels. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added, and respectfully request removal of the objection.

The Office Action further objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The Office Action states "Therefore, the limitations in claims 7-10 and 31-34...must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s)." Claims 7-10 and 31-34 have been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of this objection.

The Office Action objected to claims 21 and 45 for informalities. The Office Action stated "Claims 21 and 45 are objected to because of the following informalities: in line 3, 'LU Engine' should be referred to as --Look-Up Engine--...", (Office Action page 4). Claims 21 and 45 have been amended to recite a "Look-Up Engine" rather than a "LU Engine" as suggested by the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of this objection.

The Office Action objected to multiple claims as containing the phrase "adapted to". Applicants submit that none of the claims, as amended, contains the phrase "adapted to". Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of this objection.

The Office Action rejected claims 7-10 and 31-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 7-10 and 31-34 have been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of this rejection.

The Office Action rejected claims 3-6 and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 3-6 and 27-30 have been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of this rejection.

Appln No. 10/617,884
Amdt date September 24, 2007
Reply to Office action of March 23, 2007

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 14, 16-19, 25, 26, 35, 38, and 40-43 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,822,300 to Johnson et al. ("Johnson"). The Office Action objected to claims 13, 15, 24, 37, 39 and 48 as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but indicated they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite all of the limitations of claim 15 including all the limitations of base claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that the prior art, whether considered alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 1, as amended. Accordingly, claim 1 is believed patentable over the prior art for at least this reason.

Claims 2, 11, 12, 14, 16-23 depend from claim 1, which is believed allowable for the aforementioned reasons. Accordingly, claims 2, 11, 12, 14, 16-23 are believed to be allowable.

Claim 13 has been amended to recite all of the limitations of prior base claim 1 and prior intervening claim 12. Therefore, Applicants submit that the prior art, whether considered alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 13, as amended. Accordingly, claim 13 is believed patentable over the cited art for at least this reason.

Claim 24 has been amended to recite all of the limitations of prior base claim 1 and prior intervening claim 20. Therefore, Applicants submit that the prior art, whether considered alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 24, as amended. Accordingly, claim 24 is believed patentable over the cited art for at least this reason.

Claim 25 has been amended to recite all of the limitations of claim 39 including all the limitations of base claim 25. Applicants submit that the prior art, whether considered alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest the elements of claim 25, as amended. Accordingly, claim 25 is believed patentable over the cited art for at least this reason.

Claims 26, 35, 36, 38 and 40-47 depend from claim 25, which is believed allowable for the aforementioned reasons. Accordingly, claims 26, 35, 36, 38 and 40-47 are believed to be allowable.

Claim 37 has been amended to recite all of the limitations of prior base claim 25 and prior intervening claim 36. Therefore, Applicants submit that the prior art, whether considered

Appln No. 10/617,884
Amdt date September 24, 2007
Reply to Office action of March 23, 2007


alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 37, as amended. Accordingly, claim 37 is believed patentable over the cited art for at least this reason.

Claim 48 has been amended to recite all of the limitations of prior base claim 25 and prior intervening claim 44. Therefore, Applicants submit that the prior art, whether considered alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 48, as amended. Accordingly, claim 48 is believed patentable over the cited art for at least this reason.

Accordingly, the application is now in condition for allowance, and allowance of same is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 
Daniel M. Cavanagh
Reg. No. 41,661
626/795-9900

DMC/GXF/mr

MIR IRV1109168.1-* -09/24/07 7:01 PM